REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 9, 13, 14, 17, and 25 have been amended. Claims 26-33 are withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-25 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 14 are independent claims. The specification has been amended to correct certain informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification, particularly FIGS. 4A to 4E.

Applicants appreciate acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for foreign priority based on Korean Application 10-2003-0023219, filed on April 12, 2003.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Drawing Objection

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims.

Figure 6 has been included to illustrate the inorganic protection layer 17 provided on the second electrode as claimed in claims 8, 9, 20 and 21, as shown in the attached drawing sheet.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Rejection of Claims under Double Patenting

Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of co-pending Application No. 10/920,243.

Claim 1 has been amended, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,800,350 issued to Van Hal, *et al.* ("Van Hal"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Claim 1, as amended, recites *inter alia:*

> "An organic electroluminescent display device, comprising…a transparent moisture-absorbing layer coated on the internal surface of the front substrate, and a sealant disposed between the rear substrate and the transparent moisture-absorbing layer to couple the front substrate and the rear substrate."

Applicants respectfully submit that Van Hal does not teach or suggest at least a sealant disposed between the rear substrate and the transparent moisture-absorbing layer to couple the front substrate and the rear substrate. Rather, Van Hal discloses an electroluminescent (EL) display device, comprising adhesive 6 disposed between rear substrate 2 and cover 7, but fails to disclose or suggest that adhesive 6 is disposed between rear substrate 2 and the moisture-absorption sheet 9 (See Figure 1; See col. 4, lines 35-45). Accordingly, Van Hal fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 1. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the

features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Su, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,803,127) in view of Loy, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,102)

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-17, 20-21, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,803,127 issued to Su, *et al.* ("Su") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,321,102 issued to Loy, *et al.* ("Loy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant's disclosure. *See in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Assuming *arguendo* that the references may be combined and a reasonable expectation of success exists, the combined references do not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 14, as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> "An organic electroluminescent display device, comprising…a sealant disposed between the rear substrate and the transparent moisture-absorbing layer to couple the front substrate and the rear substrate."

Claim 14, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> "An organic electroluminescent display device comprising…a sealant disposed between the rear substrate and the moisture-absorbing layer to couple the front substrate and the rear substrate."

Applicants respectfully submit that Su does not teach or suggest at least such features. Rather, Su teaches an organic electroluminescence element, comprising sealing agent 44 disposed between substrate 42 and sealing case 46, but fails to disclose or suggest that sealing agent 44 is disposed between substrate 42 and either drying layer 50I or 50II (See Figures 2 and 3; See col. 3, line 36 to col. 4, line 9). Loy fails to cure the deficiencies of Su. Accordingly, Su in view of Loy fails to teach each and every claimed feature of the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 14.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-17, 20-21, and 23-25. Claims 2-5, 8-9, 11-13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason. Claims 15-17, 20-21, and 23-25 depend from claim 14 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 14, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Su, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,803,127) in view of Loy, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,102)

Claims 10 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,803,127 issued to Su, *et al.* ("Su") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,321,102 issued to Loy, *et al.* ("Loy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Su fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention. Loy fails to cure the deficiencies of Su. Claims 10 and 22 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are allowable at least for this reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 22. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 22 are allowable.

Su, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,803,127) in view of Loy, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,102), and further in view of Yokogawa, et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,762,553)

Claims 6-7 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,803,127 issued to Su, *et al.* ("Su") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,321,102 issued to Loy, *et al.* ("Loy"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,762,553 issued to Yokogawa, *et. al.* ("Yokogawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, Su fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed feature of the present invention. Loy and Yokogawa fail to cure the deficiencies of Su. Claims 6-7 and 18-19 depend from claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are allowable at least for this reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 6-7 and 18-19. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-7 and 18-19 are allowable.

Other Matters

In addition to the amendments mentioned above, claims 9, 13, 17, and 25 and various paragraphs of the specification have been amended solely for the purposes of informality correction, better wording and clarification. These amendments are not made for the purpose of

avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended.

Therefore, Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 20, 2006

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/BYC/kbs

ATTACHMENT: New Drawing Sheet (1)